guidance memorandum, interpreted Resolution No. 68-16 to be fully consistent with the federal antidegradation policy contained in 40 CFR part 131.12. Similarly, CWA section 303(d)(4)(B) and 40 CFR part 131.12 require that all permitting actions be consistent with the federal antidegradation policy. Together, the state and federal antidegradation policies are designed to ensure that a water body will not be degraded resulting from the permitted discharge. The Regional Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the state and federal antidegradation policies.

Discharges permitted in this Order are consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR part 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 because the discharge will not degrade any existing high quality water. The effluent limitations for ammonia nitrogen consistent with applicable Basin Plan water quality objectives and will assure attainment of the water quality standard in the receiving water. No changes to the plant's treatment facilities or processes are planned that would impact the concentrations of these constituents in the discharged effluent.

Monitoring in the effluent and receiving waters is required under this Order. The Regional Water Board may modify the terms of this Order to prevent degradation of high quality waters based on any change in the concentration of the constituents in the effluent or receiving water that indicates that a degradation of high quality waters may occur. The treatment required by this Order is the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that a pollution or nuisance will not occur and that the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.

3. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants

This Order contains both TBELs and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD, TSS, pH, and percent removal of BOD and TSS. Restrictions on BOD, TSS and pH are discussed in section IV.B. of the Fact Sheet. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations more stringent than the minimum, federal technology-based requirements that are necessary to meet water quality standards.

Water quality-based effluent limitations have been scientifically derived to implement WQOs that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the WQOs have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that toxic pollutant WQBELs were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 CFR part 131.38. The scientific procedures for calculating the individual water quality-based effluent limitations for priority pollutants are based on the CTR-SIP, which was approved by USEPA on May 18, 2000. All beneficial uses and WQOs contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by USEPA prior to May 30, 2000. Any WQOs and beneficial uses submitted to USEPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not approved by USEPA before that date, are nonetheless "applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA" pursuant to 40 CFR part 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the requirements of the CWA and the applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA.

Table F-10. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations						Basis
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instan-taneous Minimum	Instan-taneous Maximum	Average Seasonal	
$BOD_5$20°C	µg/L	10	--	15				Existing/ Secondary treatment
	lbs/day[5]	250		380				
TSS	mg/L	10		15				Existing/ Secondary treatment
	lbs/day[5]	250		380				
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5		Existing/ Basin Plan
Removal Efficiency for BOD	%	≥85	--	--				Existing/ Techno-logy Base
Removal Efficiency for TSS	%	≥85	--	--				Existing/ Techno-logy Base
Oil and Grease	mg/L	10	--	15				Existing/ BPJ
	lbs/day[5]	250	--	380				
Settleable Solids	ml/L	0.1	--	0.2				Existing/ BPJ
Total Residual Chlorine	mg/L	--	--	0.1				Existing/ Basin Plan
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	1,500	--	--				Existing/ Basin Plan
	lbs/day[5]	38,000	--	--				
Sulfate	mg/L	500	--	--				Existing/ Basin Plan
	lbs/day[5]	13,000	--	--				
Chloride	mg/L	300	--	--				Existing/ Basin Plan
	lbs/day[5]	7,500	--	--				
Boron	mg/L	1.5	--	--				Existing/ Basin Plan
	lbs/day[5]	38.0	--	--				
MBAS	mg/L	0.5	--	--				Existing/ Basin Plan
	lbs/day[5]	13.0	--	--				
Selenium	mg/L	3.4	--	9.2				SIP/ CTR
	lbs/day[5]	0.09	--	0.23				
Ammonia Nitrogen[10]	mg/L	1.9	--	4.6				Existing/ Basin Plan
	lbs/day[5]	48	--	120				
Nitrate + Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	--	--	10				Existing/ Basin Plan
	lbs/day[5]	--	--	251				
Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	--	--	1				Existing/ Basin Plan
	lbs/day[5]		--	25				

[10] The ammonia nitrogen effluent limitation is the translated effluent limitation based on the WQO for ammonia in the current Basin Plan, Table 3-1 and Table 3-2, which resulted from Resolution No. 2002-011, and 2005-014 adopted by the Regional Water Board on April 25, 2002, and December 1, 2005, respectively. This effluent limitation is derived according to the Implementation Section of Resolution No. 2002-011.

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations						Basis
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instan-taneous Minimum	Instan-taneous Maximum	Average Seasonal	
Total Phosphorus (wet-weather)[11]	mg/L	--	--	2.6				TMDL
Total Phosphorus[11] (dry-weather)	lbs/dry-weather	--	--	--			5,799	TMDL
Total Nitrogen[12] (summer season)	lbs/ season	--	--	--			8,044	TMDL
Total Nitrogen[13] (winter season)	mg/L	4.6	--	--				TMDL
Total coliform[14]	MPN or CFU/100 mL	23[14]	2.2[14]	240[14]				Existing/ Title 22
Radioactivity[15]								
Combined Radium-226 and Radium 228	pCi/L	5[15]						Existing/ Title 22
Gross Alpha particle activity (excluding radon and uranium)	pCi/L	15[15]						Existing/ Title 22
Uranium	pCi/L	20[15]						Existing/ Title 22
Gross Beta/photon emitters	millirem/ year	4[15]						Existing/ Title 22
Strontium-90	pCi/L	8[15]						Existing/ Title 22

[11] TP wet-weather and dry-weather final effluent limitation shall apply on the effective date of this permit. For the purposes of monitoring, wet-weather occurs when a rainfall event produces more than 0.25 inches of precipitation. The amount of rainfall shall be measured at the Ventura – Kingston Rain Gage D 122.

[12] TN summer season final effluent limitation shall apply 12 years after the effective date of TMDL. The summer season effluent limitation shall apply from May 1 to September 30.

[13] TN winter season final effluent limitation shall apply 12 years after the effective date of TMDL. The winter season final effluent limitation shall apply from October 1 to April 30.

[14] The wastes discharged to water courses shall at all times be adequately disinfected. For the purpose of this requirement, the wastes collected at the end of the ultraviolet (UV) channel during normal operation when the UV backup system is in use, and at the end of the chlorine contact chamber when the back up method is used shall be considered adequately disinfected if: (1) the median number of total coliform bacteria in the disinfected effluent does not exceed a 7-day median of 2.2 Most Probable Number (MPN) or Colony Forming Unit (CFU) per 100 milliliters utilizing the bacteriological results of the last seven (7) days for which an analysis has been completed, (2) the number of total coliform bacteria does not exceed 23 MPN or CFU per 100 milliliters in more than one sample within any 30-day period, and (3) no sample shall exceed 240 MPN or CFU of total coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters. Samples shall be collected at a time when wastewater flow and characteristics are most demanding on treatment facilities and disinfection processes.

[15] The radioactivity of the wastes discharged shall not exceed the limits specified in Title 22, chapter 15, article 5, sections 64442 and 64443, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), or subsequent revisions.

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations						Basis
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instan-taneous Minimum	Instan-taneous Maximum	Average Seasonal	
Tritium	pCi/L	20,000[17]						Existing/ Title 22

E. Interim Effluent Limitations

The State Water Board's Resolution 2008-0025 "Policy for Compliance Schedules in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits" (Compliance Schedule Policy) requires the Regional Water Board to establish interim numeric effluent limitations in this Order for compliance schedules longer than one year. As discussed in section VI.B.7 of this Fact Sheet, the Regional Water Board is approving a compliance schedule longer than one year for TN. According to the Implementation Plan and Schedule of the Ventura River Nutrients TMDL, Ojai Valley WWTP was provided up to 12 years to comply with TN WLAs. This TMDL included interim limitation for TN applicable all year round.

During the period beginning on the effective date of this permit and ending on 12 years after the effective date of TMDL, the Discharger shall maintain compliance with the interim effluent limitation for TN at Discharge Point 001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the attached MRP. The interim effluent limitation shall remain in effect until the final effluent limitations become effective.

TN interim effluent limitation shall apply all-year round.

Table F-11. Interim Effluent Limitation for Discharge Point 001

Parameter	Units	Interim Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instanta-neous Minimum	Instanta-neous Maximum
Total Nitrogen	mg/L	7.6	--	--		

F. Land Discharge Specifications – (Not Applicable)

G. Recycling Specifications – (Not Applicable)

V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water

Receiving water limitations are based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan and are a required part of this Order.

B. Groundwater

Limitations in this Order must protect not only surface receiving water beneficial uses, but also, the beneficial uses of underlying groundwater where there is a recharge beneficial use of the surface water. In addition to a discharge to surface water, there is discharge that can impact groundwater. Sections of the Ventura River, near the Ojai Valley WWTP discharge point, are designated as GWR beneficial use. Surface water from the Ventura River percolates into the Ventura Groundwater Basin. Since groundwater from the Basin is used to provide drinking water to the community, the groundwater aquifers should be protected.

However, neither this Order nor the MRP includes requirement for groundwater monitoring because none of the limitations are based upon the protection of MUN use of underlying

groundwater. For constituents that have limitations, the limits are based upon the Basin Plan and the CTR and are also protective of the beneficial uses of groundwater.

VI. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 CFR section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 CFR section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The Discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under section 122.42.

40 CFR sections 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) establish conditions that apply to all state-issued NPDES permits. These conditions must be incorporated into the permits either expressly or by reference. If incorporated by reference, a specific citation to the regulations must be included in the Order. Section 123.25(a)(12) of 40 CFR allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with 40 CFR section 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 CFR sections 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2) because the enforcement authority under the Water Code is more stringent. In lieu of these conditions, this Order incorporates by reference Water Code section 13387(e).

B. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

a. This provision is based on 40 CFR part 123. The Regional Water Board may reopen the permit to modify permit conditions and requirements. Causes for modifications include the promulgation of new regulations, modification in sludge use or disposal practices, or adoption of new regulations by the State Water Board or Regional Water Board, including revisions to the Basin Plan.

2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

a. **Antidegradation Analysis and Engineering Report for Proposed Plant Expansion.** In the event of any proposed plant expansion, this provision is based on the State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, which requires the Regional Water Board in regulating the discharge of waste to maintain high quality waters of the state. Prior to expanding the plant capacity, the Permittee must demonstrate that it has implemented adequate controls (e.g., adequate treatment capacity) to ensure that high quality waters will be maintained. This provision requires the Permittee to clarify that it has increased plant capacity through the addition of new treatment system(s) to obtain alternative effluent limitations for the discharge from the treatment system(s). This provision requires the Permittee to report specific time schedules for the plants projects. Prior to any plant expansion, this provision requires the Permittee to submit the Antidegradation Analysis and Engineering Report for the proposed Plant Expansion to the Regional Water Board for approval.

b. **Operations Plan for Proposed Expansion.** This provision is based on section 13385(j)(1)(D) of the CWC and allows a time period not to exceed 90 days in which the Permittee may adjust and test the treatment system(s). Prior to start-up of an expansion project, this provision requires the Permittee to submit an Operations Plan describing the actions the Permittee will take during the period of adjusting and testing to prevent violations.

c. **Treatment Plant Capacity.** The treatment plant capacity study required by this Order shall serve as an indicator for the Regional Water Board regarding Facility's increasing hydraulic capacity and growth in the service area.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

a. **Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP).** This provision is based on the requirements of section 2.4.5 of the SIP.

4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications

a. This provision is based on the requirements of 40 CFR part 122.41(e) and the previous Order.

5. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)

a. **Biosolids Requirements.** To implement CWA section 405(d), on February 19, 1993, USEPA promulgated 40 CFR part 503 to regulate the use and disposal of municipal sewage sludge. This regulation was amended on September 3, 1999. The regulation requires that producers of sewage sludge meet certain reporting, handling, and disposal requirements. It is the responsibility of the Discharger to comply with said regulations that are enforceable by USEPA, because California has not been delegated the authority to implement this program. The Discharger is also responsible for compliance with WDRs and NPDES permits for the generation, transport and application of biosolids issued by the State Water Board, other Regional Water Boards, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality or USEPA, to whose jurisdiction the Facility's biosolids will be transported and applied.

b. **Pretreatment Requirements.** This permit contains pretreatment requirements consistent with applicable effluent limitations, national standards of performance, and toxic and performance effluent standards established pursuant to sections 208(b), 301, 302, 303(d), 304, 306, 307, 403, 404, 405, and 501 of the CWA, and amendments thereto. This permit contains requirements for the implementation of an effective pretreatment program pursuant to section 307 of the CWA; 40 CFR 35 and 403; and/or Title 23, CCR section 2233.

c. **Spill Reporting Requirements.** This Order established a reporting protocol for how different types of spills, overflow or bypasses of raw or partially treated sewage from its collection system or treatment plant covered by this Order shall be reported to regulatory agencies.

The State Water Board issued General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Quality Order 2006-0003-DWQ (General Order) on May 2, 2006. The State Water Board amended the Monitoring and Reporting Program for the General Order through Order WQ 2013-0058-EXEC on August 6, 2013. The General Order requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with sewer lines one mile of pipe or greater to enroll for coverage and comply with the General Order. The General Order requires agencies to develop sanitary sewer management plans and report all sanitary sewer overflows, among other requirements and prohibitions.

The General Order contains requirements for operation and maintenance of collection systems and for reporting and mitigating sanitary sewer overflows that are more extensive, and therefore, more stringent than the requirements under federal standard provisions. The Discharger and public agencies that are discharging wastewater into the Facility were required to obtain enrollment for regulation under the SSO WDR by December 1, 2006.

6. Other Special Provisions - (Not Applicable)

7. Compliance Schedules

In general, an NPDES permit must include final effluent limitations that are consistent with CWA section 301 and with 40 CFR part 122.44(d). There are exceptions to this general rule. The State Water Board's Resolution 2008-0025 "Policy for Compliance Schedules in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits" (Compliance Schedule Policy) allows compliance schedules for new, revised, or newly interpreted WQOs or criteria, or in accordance with a TMDL. All compliance schedules must be as short as possible, and may not exceed ten years from the effective date of the adoption, revision, or new interpretation of the applicable WQO or criterion, unless a TMDL allows a longer schedule. Where a compliance schedule for a final effluent limitation exceeds one year, the Order must include interim numeric effluent limitations for that constituent or parameter, interim requirements and dates toward achieving compliance, and compliance reporting within 14 days after each interim date. The Order may also include interim requirements to control the pollutant, such as pollutant minimization and source control measures.

According to the Discharger, the Ojai Valley WWTP was upgraded in 1997 to its current configuration and treatment methods. The design, configuration, sizing of treatment facilities and process were based upon the Regional Water Board's Basin Plan in effect at the time and River Studies that indicated a Total Nitrogen (TN) design limit of 8 mg/L. Since 1997, the treatment plant operations have achieved TN values between 3.5 and 6 mg/L. The current configuration and process are unable to meet the proposed TMDL limit of 4.6 mg/L in the winter and essentially under 3 mg/L in the summer. The nitrification-denitrification process will require extensive studies, pilot testing and evaluation of state of the art treatment equipment and instrumentation to achieve the proposed lower limits. Due to the limits of precision of a biological system, exactness of achieving the proposed limits requires the plant to be modified to actually achieve much lower limits. For example, to achieve a monthly average of 4.6 mg/L TN in the winter, the process must be designed to achieve 3 mg/L. Daily variances in actual results requires operations to achieve lower results to allow for the natural variances. Expansion of the current treatment capacity to provide additional nutrient reductions may include many options depending on the chemical characteristics of the flow. Additional aeration, anoxic treatment, carbon additives, denitrification treatments, polymer additives, filtration and multistage treatments options will need to be added to the system as identified in the action plan and milestones.

The Discharger evaluated the Plant's ability to comply with the Ventura River Nutrients TMDL waste load allocations and determined that given the high variability of the conditions in the watershed, and any additional sewer connections in the future, the Facility cannot consistently meet the final effluent limitations for TN in this Order. The data supporting the need for a compliance schedule is presented below:

Table F-12. TN Plant Performance Evaluation

Date	TN Summer Season Effluent Concentration (mg/L)	TN Summer Season Plant's Performance (lbs/season)	TN Summer Seasonal Compliance Evaluation Meets Final Limit TN=8,044 lbs/season? (YES or NO)	TN Winter Season Conc. (mg/L)	TN Winter Season Compliance Evaluation Meets Final Limit TN=4.6 mg/L? (YES or NO)	TN Interim Limit Compliance Evaluation Meets Interim Limit=7.6 mg/L? (YES or NO)
1/8/2014				4.42	YES	YES
2/4/2014				1.3	YES	YES
3/5/2014				3.6	YES	YES
4/9/2014				3.09	YES	YES
5/7/2014	4.9	6,503	YES			YES
6/4/2014	4.4					YES
7/2/2014	4.2					YES
8/6/2014	3.45					YES
9/3/2014	3.6					YES
10/8/2014				5.59	NO	YES
11/5/2014				6.5	NO	YES
12/4/2014				4.44	YES	YES
1/7/2015				3.88	YES	YES
2/4/2015				3.5	YES	YES
3/4/2015				3.78	YES	YES
4/1/2015				2.31	YES	YES
5/6/2015	3	5,419	YES			YES
6/3/2015	2.45					YES
7/8/2015	11.5					NO
8/5/2015	2.9					YES
9/2/2015	3.07					YES
10/7/2015				3.89	YES	YES
11/4/2015				7	NO	YES
12/2/2015				4.56	YES	YES
1/6/2016				6.07	NO	YES
2/3/2016				5.7	NO	YES
3/2/2016				4.37	YES	YES
4/6/2016				6.82	NO	YES
5/4/2016	5.3	10,803	NO			YES
6/8/2016	5.1					YES
7/6/2016	6.7					YES
8/3/2016	6.6					YES
9/7/2016	5.35					YES
10/5/2016				3.9	YES	YES

Date	TN Summer Season Effluent Concentration (mg/L)	TN Summer Season Plant's Performance (lbs/season)	TN Summer Seasonal Compliance Evaluation Meets Final Limit TN=8,044 lbs/season? (YES or NO)	TN Winter Season Conc. (mg/L)	TN Winter Season Compliance Evaluation Meets Final Limit TN=4.6 mg/L? (YES or NO)	TN Interim Limit Compliance Evaluation Meets Interim Limit=7.6 mg/L? (YES or NO)
11/2/2016				5.6	NO	YES
12/7/2016				4.3	YES	YES
1/4/2017				5.02	NO	YES
2/8/2017				3.9	YES	YES
3/8/2017				4.27	YES	YES
4/5/2017				3.11	YES	YES
5/3/2017	4.5	10,905	NO			YES
6/8/2017	4.49					YES
7/12/2017	5.36					YES
8/2/2017	9.5					NO
9/6/2017	3.5					YES
10/5/2017				6	NO	YES
11/15/2017				4.8	NO	YES
12/13/2017				7.15	NO	YES
1/11/2018				4.1	YES	YES
2/7/2018				5.89	NO	YES
3/7/2018				4.04	YES	YES
4/11/2018				4.6	YES	YES
5/9/2018	5.8					YES
6/6/2018	6.37					YES

As indicated by the TN data above, the interim limitation has been exceeded twice while the TN final effluent limitations would have been exceeded on numerous occasions. Since the facility cannot consistently comply with the final effluent limitations for TN, the interim effluent limitation is warranted in order to provide time to complete the necessary improvements and/or construction of the treatment plant.

However, based on Table F-13 below, TP plant performance evaluation indicated that the Facility has demonstrated consistent compliance with the final effluent limitations for TP. Since the Facility has already attained compliance with the TP effluent limitations, the interim limitation is no longer warranted.

Table F-13. TP Plant Performance Evaluation

Date	TP Effluent Concentration (mg/L)	TP Dry-weather Plant's Performance (lbs/season)	TP Dry-weather Compliance Evaluation Meets Final Limit=5,799 lbs/season? (YES or NO)	TP Interim Limit Compliance Evaluation Meets Interim Limit TP=2.6 mg/L? (YES or NO)
1/8/2014	0.77	3,284	YES	YES
2/4/2014	1.4		YES	YES
3/5/2014	0.94		YES	YES
4/9/2014	0.49		YES	YES
5/7/2014	0.42		YES	YES
6/4/2014	0.264		YES	YES
7/2/2014	0.302		YES	YES
8/6/2014	0.51		YES	YES
9/3/2014	0.818		YES	YES
10/8/2014	1.52		YES	YES
11/5/2014	0.64		YES	YES
12/4/2014	0.228		YES	YES
1/7/2015	0.143	3,087	YES	YES
2/4/2015	0.19		YES	YES
3/4/2015	0.139		YES	YES
4/1/2015	0.462		YES	YES
5/6/2015	0.31		YES	YES
6/3/2015	0.555		YES	YES
7/8/2015	0.528		YES	YES
8/5/2015	0.85		YES	YES
9/2/2015	1.37		YES	YES
10/7/2015	2.07		YES	YES
11/4/2015	0.74		YES	YES
12/2/2015	1.18		YES	YES
1/6/2016	0.587	2,140	YES	YES
2/3/2016	0.15		YES	YES
3/2/2016	0.094		YES	YES
4/6/2016	0.176		YES	YES
5/4/2016	0.28		YES	YES
6/8/2016	0.703		YES	YES
7/6/2016	1.43		YES	YES
8/3/2016	0.49		YES	YES
9/7/2016	0.439		YES	YES
10/5/2016	0.392		YES	YES
11/2/2016	0.31		YES	YES
12/7/2016	0.2		YES	YES
1/4/2017	0.237	3,304	YES	YES
2/8/2017	0.16		YES	YES
3/8/2017	0.353		YES	YES
4/5/2017	0.278		YES	YES
5/3/2017	0.31		YES	YES
6/8/2017	0.344		YES	YES
7/12/2017	0.37		YES	YES

Date	TP Effluent Concentration (mg/L)	TP Dry-weather Plant's Performance (lbs/season)	TP Dry-weather Compliance Evaluation Meets Final Limit=5,799 lbs/season? (YES or NO)	TP Interim Limit Compliance Evaluation Meets Interim Limit TP=2.6 mg/L? (YES or NO)
8/2/2017	0.78		YES	YES
9/6/2017	1.38		YES	YES
10/5/2017	2.58		YES	YES
11/15/2017	0.1		YES	YES
12/13/2017	0.386		YES	YES
1/11/2018	0.181			YES
2/7/2018	0.27			YES
3/7/2018	0.122			YES
4/11/2018	0.0983			YES
5/9/2018	0.23			YES
6/6/2018	0.402			YES

The effluent limitations for TN and TP are based on the Ventura River Nutrients TMDL that became effective on June 28, 2013. The Discharger has complied with the application requirements in paragraph 4 of the Compliance Schedule Policy, and the Discharger's application demonstrates the need for additional time to implement actions to comply with the final TN effluent limitations. The Table presented above, demonstrates that the Facility cannot meet the TN final effluent limitations and that a compliance schedule is necessary to implement certain actions, including plant upgrade of the NDN processes.

a. **Waste Water Treatment Plant Upgrades**

The Ojai Valley SD has contracted with the consulting firm MWH to assess the conceptual level modifications to the Facility that might be required to comply with the final effluent limitations of the Ventura River Nutrients TMDL. Work that was previously completed identified potential nutrient discharge scenario and developed treatment concept alternative to address this scenario.

i. TN limit of 3 mg/L (as nitrogen) and TP limit of 1 mg/L (as phosphorous)

Two alternatives were identified to achieve the nutrient limits.

Alternative 1: Conversion to Modified Bardenpho process

The first alternative to improve the Facility's denitrification capacity is to convert the existing three stage process (comprised of successive anaerobic, anoxic and anaerobic zones) to a five-stage Modified Bardenpho process. The upgrade consists of the addition to the existing process of a second (post-aeration) anoxic zone, including inclusions of carbon in the form of methanol to increase denitrification, followed by a third aerobic zone. The capital cost for this option is estimated to be $16.6 million, with operation and maintenance costs of $205,000 annually (adjusted to 2012 dollars).

Alternative 2: Addition of denitrification filters

The second alternative is the addition of denitrification filters to the existing facilities, a process that serves the dual purpose of denitrification and filtration of suspended solids. The heterotrophic microorganisms cultivated on the Granular media denitrification filters will require methanol addition as a source of carbon to sustain growth. The estimated construction cost is $17.2 million and the maintenance cost is $270,000 per year (adjusted to 2012 dollars).

With either of these alternatives, optimization of phosphorus removal can be added. Based on the MWH (2007) report, the Facility has capabilities to include alum or other coagulant treatments.

In order to comply with the final effluent limitations for TN and TP, the Discharger submitted the proposed Table below including tasks and milestone dates:

Table F-14. Compliance Schedule for TN and TP Final Effluent Limitations

Task No.	Description	Start Date	End Date
1	Oxidation Ditch Process Monitoring	12/13/13	12/15/15
2	Oxidation Ditch #2 Instrumentation	06/13/13	12/01/13
3	Plant Influent/Anerobic Instrumentation	06/13/13	12/01/13
4	Filter/Effluent Instrumentation	06/13/13	12/01/13
5	System Monitoring including Seasonal Changes	12/01/13	12/01/15
6	Summary Report		03/01/15
7	Testing Analysis/Pilot Testing	06/01/14	12/01/15
8	Data Analysis	03/01/16	03/01/17
Process Upgrades - Implementation			
9	Issues Request for Quotation (RFQ)	5/1/18	7/25/18
10	Select Consultant	7/26/18	10/18/18
11	Kickoff Meeting	10/11/18	10/11/18
12	Alternative Design Options Analyses	10/12/18	11/21/18
13	Preliminary Design Report	11/22/18	3/8/19
14	CEQA/Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Studies and Approval	3/11/19	9/24/20
15	Design	9/25/20	3/25/22
16	Bid/Award	3/28/22	9/26/22
17	Construction	9/27/22	9/6/24
18	Commissioning	9/9/24	6/27/25

The compliance schedule is as short as possible. The compliance schedule for TN exceeds 10 years maximum allowed under the Compliance Schedule Policy. However, the permit's effluent limitations for TN and TP are consistent with the WLAs specified in the Ventura River Nutrients TMDL that is established through a Basin Plan Amendment. Ventura River Nutrients TMDL includes an implementation

plan that contains a compliance schedule or implementation schedule for TN and TP.

The compliance schedule for TN and TP is included in Special Provisions section VI.C.7.

VII. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

CWA section 308 and 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(h), (j)-(*l*), 122.44(i), and 122.48 require that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Regional Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), Attachment E of this Order establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements that implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the MRP for this facility.

A. Influent Monitoring

Influent monitoring is required:

1. To determine compliance with the permit conditions for BOD_5 20°C and suspended solids removal rates.
2. To assess treatment plant performance.
3. To assess the effectiveness of the Pretreatment Program.
4. As a requirement of the PMP.

B. Effluent Monitoring

The Permittee is required to conduct monitoring of the permitted discharges in order to evaluate compliance with permit conditions. Monitoring requirements are given in the MRP Attachment E. This provision requires compliance with the MRP, and is based on 40 CFR sections 122.44(i), 122.62, 122.63, and 124.5. The MRP is a standard requirement in almost all NPDES permits (including this Order) issued by the Regional Water Board. In addition to containing definition of terms, it specifies general sampling/analytical protocols and the requirements of reporting spills, violation, and routine monitoring data in accordance with NPDES regulations, the CWC, and Regional Water Board policies. The MRP also contains sampling program specific for the Permittee's advanced water treatment facility. It defines the sampling stations and frequency, pollutants to be monitored, and additional reporting requirements. Pollutants to be monitored include all pollutants for which effluent limitations are specified. Further, in accordance with section 1.3 of the SIP, a periodic monitoring is required for all priority pollutants defined by the CTR, for which criteria apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established, to evaluate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above a water quality standard.

Monitoring for those pollutants expected to be present in the discharge from the Facility, will be required as shown on the MRP and as required in the SIP. Semi-annual monitoring for priority pollutants in the effluent is required in accordance with the Pretreatment requirements.

Table F-15. Monitoring Frequency Comparison

Parameter	Monitoring Frequency (2013 Permit)	Monitoring Frequency (2018 Permit)
Total waste flow	continuous	continuous
Total residual chlorine	continuous	continuous
Turbidity	continuous	continuous
Temperature	weekly	weekly

Parameter	Monitoring Frequency (2013 Permit)	Monitoring Frequency (2018 Permit)
pH	weekly	weekly
Settleable solids	weekly	weekly
Total suspended solids	weekly	weekly
Oil and grease	quarterly	quarterly
BOD_5 20°C	weekly	weekly
Total coliform	daily	daily
Fecal Coliform	daily	not required
E.coli	weekly	weekly
Total Dissolved Solids	quarterly	quarterly
Sulfate	quarterly	quarterly
Chloride	quarterly	quarterly
Boron	quarterly	quarterly
MBAS	quarterly	quarterly
CTAS	quarterly	quarterly
Ammonia nitrogen	monthly	monthly
Nitrate + nitrite (as nitrogen)	monthly	monthly
Nitrite nitrogen	monthly	monthly
Chronic toxicity	monthly	monthly
Acute toxicity	quarterly	not required
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate	quarterly	semiannually
Fluoride	semiannually	semiannually
Iron	semiannually	semiannually
Selenium	semiannually	monthly
Total Nitrogen	monthly	monthly
Total Phosphorus	monthly	monthly
Remaining USEPA priority pollutants	semiannually	semiannually

The acute toxicity monitoring is no longer required because chronic toxicity is more stringent requirement than acute toxicity. A chemical at a low concentration can have chronic effects but no acute effect until it gets to the higher level. Fecal coliform monitoring was removed as a result of Basin Plan Resolution No. R10-005. This resolution replaced the fecal coliform with E. coli as an indicator of presence of pathogens in fresh water. The bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate monitoring frequency was reduced from quarterly to semiannually because it did not show reasonable potential to exceed the criteria. The selenium monitoring frequency was increased from semiannually to monthly because it showed reasonable potential to exceed the criteria.

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

WET protects the receiving water quality from the aggregate toxic effect of a mixture of pollutants in the effluent. An acute toxicity test is conducted over a short time period and measures mortality. A chronic toxicity test is conducted over a longer period of time and may measure mortality, reproduction, and growth. Chronic toxicity is a more stringent requirement than acute toxicity. A chemical at a low concentration can have chronic effects but no acute effects until it gets to the higher level. For this permit, chronic toxicity in the discharge is evaluated using USEPA's 2010 Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) hypothesis testing approach, and is expressed as "Pass" or "Fail" for the median monthly summary results and "Pass" or "Fail" and "Percent Effect" for each individual chronic toxicity result. The chronic

toxicity effluent limitations protect the narrative Basin Plan Water Quality Objective for chronic toxicity. The rationale for WET has been discussed extensively in section IV.C.5 of this Fact Sheet.

D. Receiving Water Monitoring

1. Surface Water

Receiving water monitoring is required to determine compliance with receiving water limitations and to characterize the water quality of the receiving water.

2. Groundwater (Not Applicable)

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. Watershed Monitoring and Bioassessment Monitoring

The goals of the Watershed-wide Monitoring Program including the bioassessment monitoring for the Ventura River Watershed are to:

a. Determine compliance with receiving water limits;

b. Monitor trends in surface water quality;

c. Ensure protection of beneficial uses;

d. Provide data for modeling contaminants of concern;

e. Characterize water quality including seasonal variation of surface waters within the watershed;

f. Assess the health of the biological community; and,

g. Determine mixing dynamics of effluent and receiving waters in the estuary.

2. Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study Program

Under the authority of section 308 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. § 1318), U.S. EPA requires major and selected minor dischargers under the NPDES Program to participate in the annual DMR-QA Study Program. The DMR-QA Study evaluates the analytical ability of laboratories that routinely perform or support self-monitoring analyses required by NPDES permits. There are two options to satisfy the requirements of the DMR-QA Study Program: (1) The Discharger can obtain and analyze a DMR-QA sample as part of the DMR-QA Study; or (2) Per the waiver issued by U.S. EPA to the State Water Board, the Discharger can submit the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study from its own laboratories or its contract laboratories. A Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study is similar to the DMR-QA Study. Thus, it also evaluates a laboratory's ability to analyze wastewater samples to produce quality data that ensure the integrity of the NPDES Program. The Discharger shall ensure that the results of the DMR-QA Study or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study are submitted annually to the State Water Board. The State Water Board's Quality Assurance Program Officer will send the DMR-QA Study results or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to U.S. EPA's DMR-QA Coordinator and Quality Assurance Manager.

VIII. CONSIDERATION OF NEED TO PREVENT NUISANCE AND CWC SECTION 13241 FACTORS.

A. Need to prevent nuisance: The state law requirements in this Order are required to prevent pollution or nuisance as defined in section 13050, subdivisions (l) and (m), of the CWC. Many are also required in accordance with narrative water quality objectives in the Basin Plan. These state requirements include, but are not limited to, groundwater limitations, spill

prevention plans, operator certification, sanitary sewer overflow reporting, and requirements for standby or emergency power.

B. Past, present, and probable future beneficial uses of water: Chapter 2 of the Basin Plan identifies designated beneficial uses for water bodies in the Los Angeles Region. Beneficial uses of water relevant to this Order are also identified above in Section III.C.1.

C. Environmental characteristics of the hydrographic unit under consideration, including the quality of water available thereto: The environmental characteristics are discussed in the Region's Watershed Management Initiative Chapter, as well as available in State of the Watershed reports and the State's CWA Section 303(d) List of impaired waters. The environmental characteristics of the hydrographic unit, including the quality of available water, will be improved by compliance with the requirements of this Order. Additional information on the Ventura River watershed is available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/regional_program/watershed/.

D. Water quality conditions that could reasonably be achieved through the coordinated control of all factors which affect water quality in the area: The beneficial uses of the waterbodies in the Ventura River watershed can reasonably be achieved through the coordinate control of all factors that affect water quality in the area. TMDLs have been developed (as required by the CWA) for many of the impairments in the watershed. A number of Regional Water Board programs and actions are in place to address the water quality impairments in the watershed, including regulation of point source municipal and industrial discharges with appropriate NPDES permits and non-point source discharges such as irrigated agriculture. All of these regulatory programs control the discharge of pollutants to surface and ground waters to prevent nuisance and protect beneficial uses. These regulatory programs have resulted in watershed solutions and have improved water quality. Generally, improvements in the quality of the receiving waters impacted by the permittee's discharges can be achieved by reducing the volume of discharges to receiving waters (e.g., through increased recycling), reducing pollutant loads through source control/pollution prevention, including operational source control such as public education (e.g., disposal of pesticides, pharmaceuticals, and personal care products into the sewer) and product or materials elimination or substitution, and removing pollutants through treatment.

E. Economic considerations: The Permittee did not present any evidence regarding economic considerations related to this Order. However, the Regional Water Board has considered the economic impact of requiring certain provisions pursuant to state law. The additional costs associated with complying with state law requirements are reasonably necessary to prevent nuisance and protect beneficial uses identified in the Basin Plan. Further, the loss of, or impacts to, beneficial uses would have a detrimental economic impact. Economic considerations related to costs of compliance are therefore not sufficient, in the Regional Water Board's determination, to justify failing to prevent nuisance and protect beneficial uses.

F. Need for developing housing within the region: The Regional Water Board has no evidence regarding the need for developing housing within the region or how the Permittee's discharge will affect that need. The Regional Water Board, however, does not anticipate that these state law requirements will adversely impact the need for housing in the area. The region generally relies on imported water to meet many of its water resource needs. Imported water makes up a vast majority of the region's water supply, with local groundwater, local surface water, and reclaimed water making up the remaining amount. This Order helps address the need for housing by controlling pollutants in discharges, which will improve the quality of local surface and ground water, as well as water available for recycling and re-use. This in turn may reduce the demand for imported water thereby increasing the region's capacity to support continued

housing development. A reliable water supply for future housing development is required by law, and with less imported water available to guarantee this reliability, an increase in local supply is necessary. Therefore, the potential for developing housing in the area will be facilitated by improved water quality.

G. Need to develop and use recycled water: The State Water Board's Recycled Water Policy requires the Regional Water Boards to encourage the use of recycled water. In addition, as discussed immediately above, a need to develop and use recycled water exists within the region, especially during times of drought. To encourage recycling, the Permittee is required by this Order to continue to explore the feasibility of recycling to maximize the beneficial reuse of tertiary treated effluent. Most of the effluent to be discharged under this Order will be reused for beneficial purposes.

IX. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Regional Water Board has considered the issuance of WDRs that will serve as an NPDES permit for Ojai Valley WWTP. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the Regional Water Board staff has developed tentative WDRs and has encouraged public participation in the WDR adoption process.

A. Notification of Interested Persons

The Regional Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDRs for the discharge and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through the following: (1) public notice in daily newspaper Ventura County Star, and (2) posting in city hall.

The public had access to the agenda and any changes in dates and locations through the Regional Water Board's website at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/.

B. Written Comments

Interested persons were invited to submit written comments concerning tentative WDRs as provided through the notification process. Comments were due either in person or by mail to the Executive Office at the Regional Water Board at losangeles@waterboards.ca.gov.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Regional Water Board, the written comments were due at the Regional Water Board office by **5:00 p.m. on November 16, 2018**.

C. Public Hearing

The Regional Water Board held a public hearing on the revised tentative WDRs during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location:

Date: **December 13, 2018**
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Location: Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Board Room
700 North Alameda Street
Los Angeles, California

Interested persons were invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Regional Water Board heard testimony pertinent to the discharge, WDRs, and permit. For accuracy of the record, important testimony was requested in writing.

D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements

Any aggrieved person may petition the State Water Board to review the decision of the Regional Water Board regarding the final WDRs. The petition must be received by the State

Water Board at the following address within 30 calendar days of the Regional Water Board's action:

State Water Resources Control Board
Office of Chief Counsel
P.O. Box 100, 1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

Or by email at waterqualitypetitions@waterboards.ca.gov

For instructions on how to file a petition for review, see:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml.

E. Information and Copying

The Report of Waste Discharge, other supporting documents, and comments received are on file and may be inspected at the address above at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Regional Water Board at the address below or by calling (213) 576-6600.

Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
320 W. 4th Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013-2343

F. Register of Interested Persons

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDRs and NPDES permit should contact the Regional Water Board, reference this facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

G. Additional Information

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this order should be directed to Raul Medina at (213) 620-2160.

ATTACHMENT G – TOXICITY REDUCTION EVALUATION (TRE) WORK PLAN OUTLINE

A. Gather and Review Information and Data

1. POTW Operations and Performance
2. POTW Influent and Pretreatment Program
3. Effluent Data, including Toxicity Results
4. Sludge (Biosolids) Data

B. Evaluate Facility Performance

C. Conduct Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE)

D. Evaluate Sources and In-Plant Controls

E. Implement Toxicity Control Measures

F. Conduct Confirmatory Toxicity Testing

ATTACHMENT H – BIOSOLIDS AND SLUDGE MANAGEMENT

BIOSOLIDS USE AND DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

A. All biosolids generated by the Discharger shall be reused or disposed of in compliance with the applicable portions of:

1. 40 CFR part 503: for biosolids that are land applied, placed in surface disposal sites (dedicated land disposal sites or monofills), or incinerated; 40 CFR part 503 Subpart B (land application) applies to biosolids placed on the land for the purpose of providing nutrients or conditioning the soil for crops or vegetation. 40 CFR part 503 Subpart C (surface disposal) applies to biosolids placed on the land for the purpose of disposal.
2. 40 CFR part 258: for biosolids disposed of in Municipal Solid Waste landfills.
3. 40 CFR part 257: for all biosolids disposal practices not covered under 40 CFR part 258 or 503.

B. The Discharger is responsible for assuring that all biosolids from its facility are used or disposed of in accordance with 40 CFR part 503, whether the Discharger reuses or disposes of the biosolids itself or transfers them to another party for further treatment, reuse, or disposal. The Discharger is responsible for informing subsequent preparers, appliers, or disposers of the requirements they must meet under 40 CFR part 503.

C. Duty to mitigate: The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to prevent or minimize any biosolids use or disposal which may adversely impact human health or the environment.

D. No biosolids shall be allowed to enter wetland or other waters of the United States.

E. Biosolids treatment, storage, and use or disposal shall not contaminate groundwater.

F. Biosolids treatment, storage, and use or disposal shall not create a nuisance such as objectionable odors or flies.

G. The Discharger shall assure that haulers who transport biosolids off site for further treatment, storage, reuse, or disposal take all necessary measures to keep the biosolids contained.

H. If biosolids are stored for over two years from the time they are generated, the Discharger must ensure compliance with all the requirements for surface disposal under 40 CFR part 503 Subpart C, or must submit a written request to USEPA with the information in part 503.20 (b), requesting permission for longer temporary storage.

I. Sewage sludge containing more than 50 mg/kg PCB's shall be disposed of in accordance with 40 CFR part 761.

J. Any off-site biosolids treatment, storage, use or disposal site operated by the Discharger within Region 4 (Los Angeles Region of RWQCB) that is not subject to its own Waste Discharge Requirements shall have facilities adequate to divert surface runoff from the adjacent area, to protect the site boundaries from erosion, and to prevent any conditions that would cause drainage from the materials in the disposal site to escape from the site. Adequate protection is defined as protected from at least a 100-year storm and from the highest tidal stage that may occur.

K. Inspection and Entry: The USEPA or an authorized representative thereof, upon the presentation of credentials, shall be allowed by the Discharger, directly or through contractual arrangements with their biosolids management contractors, to:

1. Enter upon all premises where biosolids are produced by the Discharger and all premises where Discharger biosolids are further treated, stored, used, or disposed, either by the Discharger or by another party to whom the Discharger transfers the biosolids for further treatment, storage, use, or disposal.
2. Have access to and copy any records that must be kept under the conditions of this permit or of 40 CFR part 503, by the Discharger or by another party to whom the Discharger transfers the biosolids for further treatment, storage, use, or disposal.
3. Inspect any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations used in the production of biosolids and further treatment, storage, use, or disposal by the Discharger or by another party to whom the Discharger transfers the biosolids for further treatment, storage, use, or disposal.

L. Monitoring shall be conducted as follows:

1. Biosolids shall be tested for the metals required in part 503.16 (for land application) or part 503.26 (for surface disposal), using the methods in "Test Methods for Evaluating Solids Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods" (SW-:846), as required in 503.8(b}(4}, at the following minimum frequencies:

Volume (dry metric tons/year)	Frequency
0 – 290	once per year
290 – 1500	once per quarter
1500 – 15000	once per 60 days
> 15000	once per month

For accumulated, previously untested biosolids, the Discharge shall develop a representative sampling plan, which addresses the number and location of sampling points, and collect representative samples.

Test results shall be expressed in mg pollutant per kg biosolids on a 100% dry weight basis.

Biosolids to be land applied shall be tested for Organic-N, ammonium-N, and nitrate-N at the frequencies required above.

2. Prior to land application, the Discharger 'shall demonstrate that the biosolids meet Class A or Class B pathogen reduction levels by one of the methods listed in 40 CFR part 503.32. Prior to disposal in a surface disposal site, the Discharger shall demonstrate that the biosolids meet Class B levels or shall ensure that the site is covered at the end of each operating day.
3. For biosolids that are land applied or placed in a surface disposal site, the Discharger shall track and keep records of the operational parameters used to achieve Vector Attraction Reduction requirements in 40 CFR part 503.33 (b).
4. Class 1 facilities (facilities with pretreatment programs or others designated as Class 1 by the Regional Administrator) and Federal facilities with> 5 MGD influent flow shall sample biosolids for pollutants listed under section 307 (a) of the Act (as required in the pretreatment section of the permit for POTWs with pretreatment programs.) Class 1 facilities and Federal Facilities with> 5 MGD influent flow shall test dioxins/dibenzofurans using a detection limit of < 1 pg/g during their next sampling period if they have not done so within the past 5 years and once per 5 years thereafter.

5. The biosolids shall be tested annually or more frequently if necessary to determine hazardousness in accordance with California Law.

6. If biosolids are placed in a surface disposal site (dedicated land disposal site or monofill), a qualified groundwater scientist shall develop a groundwater monitoring program for the site, or shall certify that the placement of biosolids on the site will not contaminate an aquifer.

7. Biosolids placed in a municipal landfill shall be tested semi-annually by the Paint Filter Test (SW-846, Method 9095) to demonstrate that there are no free liquids.

M. The Discharger either directly or through contractual arrangements with their biosolids management contractors shall comply with the following 40 CFR part 503 notification requirements:

1. A reuse/disposal plan shall be submitted to USEPA Region IX Coordinator and, in the absence of other state or regional reporting requirements, to the state permitting agency, prior to the use or disposal of any biosolids from this facility to a new or previously unreported site. The plan shall be submitted by the land applier of the biosolids and shall include, a description and a topographic map of the proposed site(s) for reuse or disposal, names and addresses of the applier(s) and site owner(s), and a list of any state or local permits which must be obtained. For land application sites, the plan shall include a description of the crops or vegetation to be grown, proposed nitrogen loadings to be used for the crops, and a groundwater monitoring plan if one exists.

2. If the Discharger biosolids do not meet 40 CFR part 503.13 Table 3 metals concentration limits, the Discharger must require their land applier to contact the state permitting authority to determine whether bulk biosolids subject to the cumulative pollutant loading rates in 40 CFR part 503.12(b)(2) have been applied to the site since July 20, 1993, and, if so, the cumulative amount of pollutants applied to date, and background concentration, if known. The Discharger shall then notify USEPA Region IX Coordinator of this information.

3. For biosolids that are land applied, the Discharger shall notify the applier in writing of the nitrogen content of the biosolids, and the applier's requirements under 40 CFR part 503, including the requirements that the applier certify that the requirement to obtain information in Subpart A, and that the management practices, site restrictions, and any applicable vector attraction reduction requirements Subpart D have been met. The Discharger shall require the applier to certify at the end of 38 months following application of Class B biosolids that those harvesting restrictions in effect for up to 38 months have been met.

4. If bulk biosolids are shipped to another State or to Indian Lands, the Discharger must send written notice prior to the initial application of bulk biosolids to the permitting authorities in the receiving State or Indian Land (the USEPA Regional Office for the area and the State/Indian authorities).

5. Notification of 40 CFR part 503 non-compliance: The Discharger shall require appliers of their biosolids to notify USEPA Region 9 and their state permitting agency of any noncompliance within 24 hours if the non-compliance may seriously endanger health or the environment. For other instances of non-compliance, the Discharger shall require appliers of their biosolids to notify USEPA Region 9 and their state permitting agency of the non-compliance in writing within 10 working days of becoming aware of the non-compliance.

N. The Discharger shall submit an annual biosolids report to USEPA Region IX Biosolids Coordinator and the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board by February 19 of each year for the period covering the previous calendar year. The report shall include:

1. The amount of biosolids generated that year, in dry metric tons, and the amount accumulated from previous years.
2. Results of all pollutant monitoring required in the Monitoring Section above.
3. Descriptions of pathogen reduction methods, and vector attraction reduction methods, as required in 40 CFR parts 503.17 and 503.27.
4. Results of any groundwater monitoring or certification by groundwater scientist that the placement of biosolids in a surface disposal site will not contaminate an aquifer.
5. Names and addresses of land appliers and surface disposal site operators, and volumes applied (dry metric tons).
6. Names and addresses of persons who received biosolids for storage, further treatment, disposal in a municipal waste landfill, or for other reuse/disposal methods not covered in N.3, above, and volumes delivered to each.

O. The Discharger shall require all parties contracted to manage their biosolids to submit an annual biosolids report to USEPA Region IX Biosolids Coordinator by February 19 of each year for the period covering the previous calendar year. The report shall include:

1. Names and addresses of land appliers and surface disposal site operators, name, location (latitude/longitude), and size (hectares) of site(s), volumes applied/disposed (dry metric tons) and for land application, biosolids loading rates (metric tons per hectare), nitrogen loading rates (kg/ha), dates of applications, crops grown, dates of seeding and harvesting and certifications that the requirement to obtain information in 40 CFR part 503.12(e)(2), management practices in part 503.14 and site restrictions in part 503.32(b)(5) have been met.

ATTACHMENT I – PRETREATMENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Ojai Valley Sanitation District (Permittee or District) is required to submit annual Pretreatment Program Compliance Report (Report) to the Regional Water Board and United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9 (USEPA). This Attachment outlines the minimum reporting requirements of the Report. If there is any conflict between requirements stated in this attachment and provisions stated in the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR), those contained in the WDR will prevail.

A. PRETREATMENT REQUIREMENTS

1. The Permittee shall be responsible and liable for the performance of all Control Authority pretreatment requirements contained in 40 CFR part 403, including any subsequent regulatory revisions to part 403. Where part 403 or subsequent revision places mandatory actions upon the Permittee as Control Authority but does not specify a timetable for completion of the actions, the Permittee shall complete the required actions within six months from the issuance date of this permit or the effective date of the part 403 revisions, whichever comes later. For violations of pretreatment requirements, the Permittee shall be subject to enforcement actions, penalties, fines and other remedies by the USEPA or other appropriate parties, as provided in the Act. USEPA may initiate enforcement action against a nondomestic user for noncompliance with applicable standards and requirements as provided in the act.
2. The Permittee shall enforce the requirements promulgated under sections 307(b), 307(c), 307(d) and 402(b) of the Act with timely, appropriate and effective enforcement actions. The Permittee shall cause all nondomestic users subject to federal categorical standards to achieve compliance no later than the date specified in those requirements or, in the case of a new nondomestic user, upon commencement of the discharge.
3. The Permittee shall perform the pretreatment functions as required in 40 CFR part 403 including, but not limited to:
   a. Implement the necessary legal authorities as provided in 40 CFR part 403.8(f)(1);
   b. Enforce the pretreatment requirements under 40 CFR parts 403.5 and 403.6;
   c. Implement the programmatic functions as provided in 40 CFR part 403.8(f)(2); and
   d. Provide the requisite funding and personnel to implement the pretreatment program as provided in 40 CFR part 403.8(f)(3).
4. The Permittee shall submit annually a report to USEPA Pacific Southwest Region, and the State describing its pretreatment activities over the previous year. In the event the Permittee is not in compliance with any conditions or requirements of this permit, then the Permittee shall also include the reasons for noncompliance and state how and when the Permittee shall comply with such conditions and requirements. This annual report shall cover operations from January 1 through December 31 and is due on April 15 of each year. The report shall contain, but not be limited to, the following information:
   a. A summary of analytical results from representative, flow proportioned, 24-hour composite sampling of the publicly-owned treatment works (POTW) influent and effluent for those pollutants USEPA has identified under section 307(a) of the Act which are known or suspected to be discharged by nondomestic users. This will consist of an annual full priority pollutant scan, with quarterly samples analyzed only for those pollutants detected in the full scan. The Permittee is not required to sample and analyze for asbestos. Sludge sampling and analysis are covered in the

sludge section of this permit. The Permittee shall also provide any influent or effluent monitoring data for nonpriority pollutants which the Permittee believes may be causing or contributing to interference or pass through. Sampling and analysis shall be performed with the techniques prescribed in 40 CFR part 136;

b. A discussion of Upset, Interference or Pass Through incidents, if any, at the treatment plant which the Permittee knows or suspects were caused by nondomestic users of the POTW system. The discussion shall include the reasons why the incidents occurred, the corrective actions taken and, if known, the name and address of the nondomestic user(s) responsible. The discussion shall also include a review of the applicable pollutant limitations to determine whether any additional limitations, or changes to existing requirements, may be necessary to prevent pass through or interference;

c. An updated list of the Permittee's significant industrial users (SIUs) including their names and addresses, and a list of deletions, additions and SIU name changes keyed to the previously submitted list. The Permittee shall provide a brief explanation for each change. The list shall identify the SIUs subject to federal categorical standards by specifying which set(s) of standards are applicable to each SIU. The list shall also indicate which SIUs are subject to local limitations;

d. The Permittee shall characterize the compliance status of each SIU by providing a list or table which includes the following information:

   i. Name of the SIU;

   ii. Category, if subject to federal categorical standards;

   iii. The type of wastewater treatment or control processes in place;

   iv. The number of samples taken by the POTW during the year;

   v. The number of samples taken by the SIU during the year;

   vi. For an SIU subject to discharge requirements for total toxic organics, whether all required certifications were provided;

   vii. A list of the standards violated during the year. Identify whether the violations were for categorical standards or local limits;

   viii. Whether the facility is in significant noncompliance (SNC) as defined at 40 CFR part 403.8(f)(2)(viii) at any time during the year; and

   ix. A summary of enforcement or other actions taken during the year to return the SIU to compliance. Describe the type of action, final compliance date, and the amount of fines and penalties collected, if any. Describe any proposed actions for bringing the SIU into compliance.

e. A brief description of any programs the POTW implements to reduce pollutants from nondomestic users that are not classified as SIUs;

f. A brief description of any significant changes in operating the pretreatment program which differ from the previous year including, but not limited to, changes concerning the program's administrative structure, local limits, monitoring program or monitoring frequencies, legal authority, enforcement policy, funding levels, or staffing levels;

g. A summary of the annual pretreatment budget, including the cost of pretreatment program functions and equipment purchases; and

h. A summary of activities to involve and inform the public of the program including a copy of the newspaper notice, if any, required under 40 CFR part 403.8(f)(2)(viii).

B. LOCAL LIMITS EVALUATION

1. In accordance with 40 CFR part 122.44(j)(2)(ii), the POTW shall provide a written technical evaluation of the need to revise local limits under 40 CFR part 403.5(c)(1) within 180 days of issuance or reissuance of the Hyperion Treatment Plant NPDES permit.

C. SIGNATORY REQUIREMENTS AND REPORT SUBMITTAL

1. Signatory Requirements.

   The annual report must be signed by a principal executive officer, ranking elected official or other duly authorized employee if such employee is responsible for the overall operation of the POTW. Any person signing these reports must make the following certification [40 CFR part 403.6(a)(2)(ii)]:

   I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

2. Report Submittal.

   The Annual Pretreatment Report shall be submitted electronically using the State Water Board's California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program website http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html. The CIWQS website will provide additional information for SMR submittal in the event there will be a planned service interruption for electronic submittal.

   A copy of the Annual Pretreatment Report must be sent to USEPA electronically to the following address:

   R9Pretreatment@epa.gov